UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,269	08/09/2001	Thomas D. Petite	081607-1210	5550

24504 7590 01/03/2003

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER
BARAN, MARY C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2857	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/925,269	Applicant(s) PETITE, THOMAS D.
	Examiner Mary Kate B Baran	Art Unit 2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 June 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 August 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2,3,4* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 305, 300, 260, 405, 415, 425, 435, 445, 455, 500, 510, 520, 530, 540, 550, 560, 570, 580, 590, 700, 702, 704, 810, 820, 830, 840, 910, 920, 930, and 940. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 230, 235, 240, 270, 275, 280, 600, 602, 604, 610, 620, 630, 640, 710, 720, 730, and 740. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to because the following reference characters "transceiver controller 410", "memory 420", "modem 430", "memory sector 440", and "power supply 450", are labeled as such in the specification, however, these reference characters do not refer to the components in Figure 5. A proposed drawing correction

or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

(a) On page 9 line 9, "Reference is now made..." should be indented.

(b) On page 16 line 5, reference is made to an application number; however, this application number is not given.

(c) On page 26 line 6, "device s" should be – devices --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

(a) On page 35 line 14, "of the plurality wireless" should be – of the plurality of wireless --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-16, 19-23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,491) in view of Shaughnessy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,137).

Referring to claim 1, Canada et al. teaches a wireless communication network adapted for use in an automated monitoring system for monitoring and controlling a plurality of remote devices via a host computer (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a plurality of wireless transceivers having unique identifiers (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 13-35), each of the plurality of wireless transceivers configured to receive a sensor data signal from one of the plurality of remote devices and transmit an original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier and sensor data signal (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54), and further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57), the repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 61-67) including the sensor data signal and the corresponding unique identifier (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57); and a site controller in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers, the site controller configured to receive the original data messages and the repeated data messages (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57), identify the remote device associated with the corresponding sensor data signal (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 13-35) and provide information related to the sensor data to the host computer (see

Canada et a., Figure 8 "PC Network 10"). Canada et al. does not teach a wide area network, or a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy et al. teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy et al., Figure 2) and a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al. to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol allows the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy et al., column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 2, Canada et al. discloses a plurality of repeaters having unique identifiers (see Canada et al., column 8 lines 36-38), each of the plurality of repeaters in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and configured to receive the original data message transmitted by the at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 61-67), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal from the original data message and the unique identifier corresponding to the repeater (see Canada et al., column 8 lines 36-38), but does not teach a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy et al. teaches a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a predefined protocol allows the skilled artisan to allows the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy et al., column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 3, Canada et al. further teaches a site controller further configured to provide a command message to one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and each of the plurality of wireless transceivers are further configured to transmit, in response to the command message, the original data message, wherein the original data message corresponds to the command message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 4, Shaughnessy et al. further teaches the predefined communication protocol comprises a data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 49-58) comprising: a receiver address identifying the receiver of the data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 14-32); a sender address identifying the sender of the data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 6 lines 34-45); and a command indicator specifying a predefined command code (see Shaughnessy et al., column 6 lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy

et al. because using a predefined communication protocol with a data packet allows the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 7, Canada et al. further teaches the data packet comprises, a packet length indicator which indicates a total number of bytes in the current packet (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 50-59), but does not teach a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message; and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet; and a message number identifying the current message.

Shaughnessy et al. discloses a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message (see Shaughnessy et al., column 4 lines 8-17); and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 49-51); and a message number identifying the current message (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 54-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a data packet allows the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 8, Canada et al. discloses a wireless communication network adapted for use in an automated monitoring system for monitoring and controlling a

plurality of remote devices via a host computer (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a plurality of wireless transceivers having unique identifiers (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 13-35), each of the plurality of wireless communication means configured to receive a sensor data signal from one of the plurality of remote devices and transmit an original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier and sensor data signal (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54), and further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 61-67) and the corresponding unique identifier (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57); a means for receiving each of the original data messages and the repeated data messages (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57); a means for identifying, for each received message, the remote device associated with the corresponding sensor data signal (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 13-35); and a means for providing information related to the sensor data signal to the host computer (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54). Canada et al. does not teach a wide area network, or a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy et al. teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy et al., Figure 2) and a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al. to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et

al. because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol allows the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy et al., column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 9, Canada et al. teaches a plurality of repeating means having unique identifiers (see Canada et al., column 8 lines 36-38), each of the plurality of repeating means in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless communication means and comprising a means for receiving the original data message transmitted by the at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and a means for transmitting a repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 61-67), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal from the original data message and the unique identifier corresponding to the repeater (see Canada et al., column 8 lines 36-38). Canada et al. does not teach a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy et al. teaches a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a predefined protocol allows the skilled artisan to allows the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy et al., column 2 lines 45-49)..

Referring to claim 10, Canada et al. teaches a means for providing a command message to one of the plurality of wireless communication means, wherein each of the wireless communication means further comprise a means for transmitting, in response to the command message, the original data message, wherein the original data message corresponds to the command message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 11, Shaughnessy et al. further teaches the predefined communication protocol comprises a data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 49-58) comprising: a means for identifying the receiver of the data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 14-32); a means for identifying the sender of the data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 6 lines 34-45); and a command means for specifying a predefined command code (see Shaughnessy et al., column 6 lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a predefined communication protocol with a data packet allows the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 50-53)..

Referring to claim 12, Canada et al. further teaches a data packet further comprising: a means for indicating a total number of bytes in the current packet(see Canada et al., column 5 lines 50-59), but does not teach a total packet indicator which

indicates the total number of packets in the current message; and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet; and a message number identifying the current message.

Shaughnessy et al. discloses a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message (see Shaughnessy et al., column 4 lines 8-17); and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 49-51); and a message number identifying the current message (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 54-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a data packet allows the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 13, Canada et al. discloses a wireless communication network for monitoring and controlling a plurality of remote devices via a host computer (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a plurality of wireless transceivers having unique identifiers (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 13-35), each of the plurality of wireless transceivers configured to receive a sensor data signal from one of the plurality of remote devices and transmit an original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier and sensor data signal (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54), and further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated

data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57, the repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 61-67) including the sensor data signal and the corresponding unique identifier (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57); and a site controller in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57), wherein at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers is further configured to provide the original data messages and the repeated data messages to a site controller (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57). Canada et al. does not teach a wide area network, or a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy et al. teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy et al., Figure 2) and a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al. to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol allows the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy et al., column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 14, Canada et al. discloses a plurality of repeaters having unique identifiers (see Canada et al., column 8 lines 36-38), each of the plurality of repeaters in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and configured to receive the original data message transmitted by the at least one of the

plurality of wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 61-67), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal from the original data message and the unique identifier corresponding to the repeater (see Canada et al., column 8 lines 36-38), but does not teach a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy et al. teaches a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a predefined protocol allows the skilled artisan to allows the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy et al., column 2 lines 45-49)..

Referring to claim 15, Canada et al. teaches at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers is further configured to receive a command message for one of the plurality of wireless transceivers (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 16, Shaughnessy et al. further teaches the predefined communication protocol comprises a data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 49-58) comprising: a receiver address identifying the receiver of the data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 14-32); a sender address identifying the sender of the data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 6 lines 34-45); and a command

indicator specifying a predefined command code (see Shaughnessy et al., column 6 lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a predefined communication protocol with a data packet allows the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 50-53)..

Referring to claim 19, Canada et al. further teaches the data packet comprises, a packet length indicator which indicates a total number of bytes in the current packet (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 50-59), but does not teach a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message; and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet; and a message number identifying the current message.

Shaughnessy et al. discloses a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message (see Shaughnessy et al., column 4 lines 8-17); and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 49-51); and a message number identifying the current message (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 54-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy

et al. because using a data packet allows the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 20, Canada et al. discloses a wireless communication network for monitoring and controlling a plurality of remote devices via a host computer (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a plurality of wireless transceivers having unique identifiers (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 13-35), each of the plurality of wireless transceivers configured to receive a sensor data signal from one of the plurality of remote devices and transmit an original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier and sensor data signal (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54), and further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57), the repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 61-67) including the sensor data signal and the corresponding unique identifier (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-57); and a site controller in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers, wherein at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers is further configured to provide the original data messages and the repeated data messages to a primary wireless communication network associated with an automated monitoring system (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 41-57). Canada et al. does not teach a wide area network, or a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy et al. teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy et al., Figure 2) and a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al. to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol, or using a wireless connection, allows the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy et al., column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 21, Canada et al. discloses a plurality of repeaters having unique identifiers (see Canada et al., column 8 lines 36-38), each of the plurality of repeaters in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and configured to receive the original data message transmitted by the at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 61-67), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal from the original data message and the unique identifier corresponding to the repeater (see Canada et al., column 8 lines 36-38), but does not teach a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy et al. teaches a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a predefined protocol allows the skilled artisan to allows the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy et al., column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 22, Canada et al. teaches at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers is further configured to receive a command message for one of the plurality of wireless transceivers from the primary wireless communication network and transmit the command message to the one of the plurality of wireless transceivers (see Canada et al., column 4 lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 23, Shaughnessy et al. further teaches the predefined communication protocol comprises a data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 49-58) comprising: a receiver address identifying the receiver of the data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 14-32); a sender address identifying the sender of the data packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 6 lines 34-45); and a command indicator specifying a predefined command code (see Shaughnessy et al., column 6 lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a predefined communication protocol with a data packet allows the

skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 50-53)..

Referring to claim 26, Canada et al. further teaches the data packet comprises, a packet length indicator which indicates a total number of bytes in the current packet (see Canada et al., column 5 lines 50-59), but does not teach a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message; and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet; and a message number identifying the current message.

Shaughnessy et al. discloses a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message (see Shaughnessy et al., column 4 lines 8-17); and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 49-51); and a message number identifying the current message (see Shaughnessy et al., column 5 lines 54-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada et al., to include the teachings of Shaughnessy et al. because using a data packet allows the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy et al., column 3 lines 50-53).

7. Claims 5, 6, 17, 18, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,491) in view of Shaughnessy et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,137) and further in view of Casais (U.S. Patent No. 6,288,641).

Referring to claims 5, 17 and 24, Canada et al. and Shaughnessy et al. teach al. the features of the claimed invention except for a plurality of wireless transceivers further configured to receive signals via Bluetooth technology.

Casais teaches a plurality of wireless transceivers further configured to receive signals via Bluetooth technology (see Casais, column 5 lines 36-50).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Canada et al. and Shaughnessy et al. to include the teachings of Casais because remote monitoring with Bluetooth technologies allows increased flexibility of positioning and repositioning.

Referring to claims 6, 18 and 25, Canada et al. and Shaughnessy et al. teach al. the features of the claimed invention except for a plurality of wireless transceivers further configured to receive signals via IEEE standard 802.11(b).

Casais teaches a plurality of wireless transceivers further configured to receive signals via IEEE standard 802.11(b) (see Casais, column 5 lines 36-50).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Canada et al. and Shaughnessy et al. to include the teachings of Casais because remote monitoring using IEEE standard 802.11(b) allows increased flexibility of positioning and repositioning.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(a) Pacheco et al. teaches a computer-based notification system having redundant sensor alarm determination and associated computer-implemented method for issuing notification of events.

(b) IEEE Standards Board which discloses the IEEE standard 802.11(b).

(c) IEEE Std 802.15.1 which discloses the Bluetooth technology.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Kate B Baran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4474. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S Hoff can be reached on (703) 308-1677. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

MKB
December 20, 2002

MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800